

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CRD5035CIP1 6702 10/23/2003 Donald K. Jones 10/691,846 **EXAMINER** 27777 05/25/2005 7590 WEBB, SARAH K PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003 3731

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Attachment(s)

١	Notice of References Cited	(PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/5/05.

4) [	Interview Summary (PTO-413
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_

Application/Control Number: 10/691,846 Page 2

Art Unit: 3731

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "tight fitting gap") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In regards to this issue, the only requirements in the claims are that the proximal and distal cylindrical members define a gap and the anchors have a length less than the length of the gap. These limitations are significantly broad enough to encompass a structure where the anchors are not tightly fitted into the gaps. The specification also does not fully support a "tight fitting gap." The specification simply states that the gap maintains longitudinal position of the stent.

Page 8, line 20 through page 9, line 3 of applicant's disclosure describes the gap structure:

Disposed about the elongated core wire 14 are a proximal cylindrical member 16 and a distal cylindrical member 18, both of which may take the form of a helical coil. A self- expanding sent 20 is mounted on the elongated core wire

Application/Control Number: 10/691,846 Page 3

Art Unit: 3731

14. The proximal and distal cylindrical members 16, 18 are spaced apart to form a gap between the cylindrical member and serve as stop members extending radially outward from the core wire 14 to engage the stent 20 in order to prevent longitudinal movement of the stent relative to the core wire 14.

Page 12, lines 6-10 of the disclosure reads:

The self-expanding stent 20 is mounted on the elongated com wire 14 such that the <u>anchor members 52 align with and are disposed within the gap 42</u> between the proximal and distal cylindrical members 16, 18. In this configuration, the stent 20 is engaged to the core wire 14 so that the stent may be moved proximally and distally through the delivery lumen 7 of the balloon catheter 2.

The specification fails to state that the gap and anchors are tightly fitted with one another to provide a means for repositioning a partially expanded stent.

Beginning on line 22 of page 12, the disclosure describes the process of repositioning the stent. The disclosure does not provide support that the means for repositioning is provided by a "tight fitting gap." Rather, it is interpreted that the non-severed proximal retaining ring is the part of the device that provides a means for withdrawing the stent back into the catheter so it can be repositioned.

3. Applicant argues that the gap shown in the Lau reference in Figure 19a appears to be about 10 times longer than the radiopaque marker in the Giocoechea reference. In response, examiner points out that this is substantially similar to the structure disclosed by applicant. The gap 42 defined between the proximal and distal members 16,18 is about 10 times longer than radiopaque members 52 mounted on the stent.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 4. Claims 1-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,225 to Lau et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,165,213 to Goicoechea et al. Details of this rejection are provided in a prior office action.
- 5. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Lau and Goicoechea, as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Barry. Details of this rejection are provided in a prior office action.

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

6. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS**MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date

Application/Control Number: 10/691,846 Page 5

Art Unit: 3731

of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah K Webb whose telephone number is (571) 272-4706. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SKW 5/17/05

JULIAN W. WOO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Juhan W Moo